LITTLE BOOKS
ON
DOCTRINE

Class BT765

Book .M5

Copyright No.

COPYRIGHT DEPOSIT.

25 M4

SANCTIFICATION

RIGHT VIEWS AND OTHER VIEWS

Ralph Nelson Pub.

By S. M. MERRILL

CINCINNATI: JENNINGS & PYE
NEW YORK: EATON & MAINS
c1901

Hw.

BT765
.M5

THE LIBRARY OF
CONGRESS,
TWO COPIES RECEIVED
AUG. 10 1901
COPYRIGHT ENTRY
Aug. 31, 1901
CLASS a XXc. No
15978
COPY B.

COPYRIGHT, 1901, BY
THE WESTERN METH-
ODIST BOOK CONCERN.

Recat. HLR 2 Sept

PREFATORY NOTE.

This little booklet is not a treatise, but a summary of views designed to give direction to inquirers wishing to pursue the subject in its doctrinal bearings as well as in its practical features. It is sent out with the hope that it may aid in removing the reproach that has come to the doctrine through partial, superficial, and extreme teachings, and my prayer goes with it that its mission may be successful.

S. M. M.

Chicago, *June*, 1901.

SANCTIFICATION.

I.

In presenting the following thoughts on sanctification I wish to say that it is not my purpose to set forth views differing from the current belief of the Church, but rather to make that belief clear to the understanding of ordinary inquirers, and to free it somewhat from the mists that have gathered about it by reason of partisan and inadequate representations.

My persuasion is firm that the founders of our Methodism apprehended and forcefully presented the scope and spirit of the

Gospel with reference to the privileges of believers in their wonderful experiences of emerging from sin—death—into the full-orbed life of righteousness. They did this in the presence of difficulties which we can not appreciate, since conditions have so changed as to make things plain to us which were seen but dimly, if at all, in their day. The shifting grounds of opposition to the doctrines of the Church necessarily affect the expressions of the defenders of the faith, giving the appearance of modifications of belief where no real change has taken place. In this way it has occurred that some of the pulpits of Methodism have caused honest inquirers to have trouble in distinguishing between accurate and inaccurate representations of the most vital

teachings of the fathers, and made it possible for intense zeal and bold assertion to take the place of intelligent exposition, resulting in the mystification and confusion of patient hearers.

Instead of propounding a theory of sanctification which will emphasize some particular feature or incident or manifestation of the work, to me it seems well to avoid theorizing as far as possible, and to confine attention to the facts of the Gospel, and to the essential nature of the work of grace designated by this word, and by kindred and correlative terms. Sanctification is at most only a part of the work of salvation, and represents a feature which does not exist except in conjunction with other features bearing a similar relation to the

whole. Salvation is the more comprehensive term, and in an important sense the work of salvation is a unit; that is, it is one work or one deliverance, resulting, it may be, from a variety of agencies, but, nevertheless, it is a concrete experience, which has a distinct beginning, and progresses and matures or culminates in the complete renewal of the soul in the image of God. This great work may be called, in general terms, conversion, salvation, or sanctification, as the desire may be to emphasize one particular feature of it, or to express it comprehensively as a whole.

If I understand current thought on this subject, the differences of opinion and the discussions which arise with regard to it relate almost entirely to the analysis of the

work, to the separation of it into different parts or elements, and to descriptions of these parts in their isolation and in their relations to one another and to the whole. Theorizing finds its purpose and sphere in this work of differentiation, and the Scriptures give little countenance or assistance to it. So long as attention is kept upon the work of salvation as a whole, or upon its results in lifting the believer into a new life and new relations to God, there is little room for differences of opinion or for disputations about modes and processes; for in actual experience the work is so unique, so complete in its results, so perfectly adapted to the needs and longings of the soul, and so manifestly the work of God's infinite wisdom and love, that it is gladly

accepted as the Divine healing, as one who has been sick accepts restored health and rejoices in it without waiting to comprehend the functions and agencies employed in his recovery.

There is, however, a possible analysis of this work, which, when rightly made, may be edifying, and aid in the elucidation of the subject as a whole, as well as in understanding the terms employed in the Scriptures with reference to it. In point of fact, there are different elements in the experience of salvation from sin—elements distinct and vital—which must be considered separately and conjointly if a comprehensive and discriminating view is taken of the subject.

The legal side of this work comes first

in order, and deserves more thought than is usually bestowed upon it. It comes first because it precedes and provides for every other part, and is so related to the whole scheme of salvation that all else will be darkness unless light shines here. To this side or department belong all those terms which speak of sin and of salvation as related to the law of God or as affected by it. Sin, transgression, condemnation; pardon, forgiveness, justification—these are forensic terms, drawing their meaning from the law and from the Divine dealing with men under the law, or as related to it. It is not possible to get hold of the meaning of Christ's mission without studying it in the light of the relation of God's law to men and to the universe. The whole

office of the Redeemer has primarily a relation to the law, and especially to its inflexibility and universality. Redemption from the curse of the law was his great work, and underlies all experiences and all gracious privileges. The expiation of human guilt by his sacrifice was the great legal transaction. That was the atonement —the redemption. Every gracious benefit flows from that as a stream from its fountain.

The making over to the individual sinner of the merit of the sacrifice of Christ is the first legal transaction with the penitent who seeks salvation. This work accomplished is justification in the sense of pardon or forgiveness. It is legal in its relation to the law, but it is a comprehensive

blessing, carrying with it the legal right to every other element of the generic or concrete salvation, securing the reversal of the sentence of condemnation, the new birth of the soul into the life of God, the washing away of legal and moral defilement contracted by actual sin, and therefore a gracious adoption into the family of God. It is not an isolated blessing going before other blessings, and leaving them to follow or to fail. Its precedence is in the order of thought and the order of its relation, and not in the order of time and of fact. The justified man is the converted man. It must be, therefore, that the justified state implies the presence of the concomitants of justification, and means that every justified believer is regenerated by the Holy Spirit,

and sanctified through the blood of the everlasting covenant.

This view of the conversion of a sinner indicates the tremendous significance of the wonderful achievement. It also brings to the believer the possibility of a just appreciation of his present inheritance in Christ, and of the richness of that grace which has abounded unto him through the faith that brought pardon and peace and personal acceptance. When the Spirit attests the filial relation attained, it also brings assurance of the fullness of the love of Christ yet to be unfolded in the developing graces and experiences to be wrought out in daily duties, self-denials, temptations, victories, and consecrations, till the incipient life implanted expands and

matures into the richer fruitage promised in the gift of the Comforter.

As just indicated, there is a life-side or a life-element in this work which calls for special consideration. The necessity of this element is found in the condition of the sinner, and it is, therefore, neither speculative, hypothetical, nor arbitrary, but a fact. The sinner is dead—"dead in trespasses and sins"—dead spiritually, and therefore inactive and helpless. In the experience of the generic salvation, he passes "from death into life." When guilt is canceled and condemnation removed, the quickening Spirit imparts new life. This is regeneration, the new birth, the beginning to live again as a new creature. It is not identical with pardon, but accompanies it.

The justified are not left in a state of death. "He that hath the Son of God hath life." "The dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and they that hear shall live." They are made alive in Christ; they are risen with Christ. Each one can say, "I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me." To be born is to begin to live; to be born again is to begin to live a new life, the life of Him of whom we are born. Every one born of God has the life of God within him. This is the vital fact in salvation. A dead soul can not be a child of God.

I have been impressed many times that too little attention is given to this life element. Regeneration always relates to it in the Scriptures, and it is the source of light, spiritual vision, activity, power over sin,

and of the aggressive forces brought out in the conflicts with evil, as well as the ground of all growth in grace and holiness.

There is another element in this salvation which also has place because of the condition of the subject of it. The sinner is condemned, as we have seen, and must be justified; he is dead, and must be made alive; and he is also morally polluted or filthy, and must be washed or cleansed. This washing process is distinct from the quickening process which gives life, but is not separate from it. No converted soul remains unwashed. Such a condition is scarcely thinkable. This washing is sanctification. The word means just this. It relates to the act of cleansing, and thus introduces the element of purity as regen-

eration does the element of life. Hence, every sinner is washed when he is saved—converted. He is justified, regenerated, sanctified; for salvation includes these three elements or processes. As God has no dead children, none not made alive in Christ, so he never owns an unwashed or unsanctified child. The experience of salvation includes every needed process and element. The Apostle Paul, in his letter to the Corinthians, speaks of "babes in Christ," and declares them sanctified in Christ. They were sanctified as surely as they were born into the kingdom. Mr. Wesley taught exactly this, and Mr. Fletcher, Adam Clarke, Richard Watson, Joseph Benson, and all the old Methodist divines taught it without exception. It can scarcely be called a

theory; it is not a theory, but a fact, for it accepts the fact without attempting to explain its modes.

From the beginning, Methodism has held that all believers are sanctified at conversion—that salvation includes justification, regeneration, and sanctification, making a complete deliverance from the guilt, power, and pollution of sin. There is nothing new, dark, or misleading in this, and yet it is not a full statement of the doctrine of the Church, as the intelligent reader will at once discover. It only claims to be correct as far as it goes. The fact must be added, and stated with all distinctness, that Methodism has always made a distinction between sanctification as a concomitant of justification, and "entire sancti-

fication," using the modifying word to distinguish the subsequent and fuller work which comes after conversion, sometimes at a much later date, and often reveals itself in connection with some wonderful spiritual uplift. The authorities in Methodism above named not only taught the expediency of making the distinction between the ordinary sanctification and "entire" sanctification, but the necessity of it, holding it to be impossible to convey the idea of the higher state by the use of the word sanctification without the use of an auxiliary, such as "entire," "wholly," or the like; so that it is the phase of the subject brought before us by these qualifying terms that calls for particular attention.

It is worthy of remark at this point that

nearly all the theorizings, speculations, and disputations that have distracted and afflicted the Church in connection with the subject of sanctification have occurred with reference to this last feature of the general doctrine, and a deplorable condition has ensued in many places. Sad indeed that the most precious things of the Gospel should be liable to such abuse!

II.

THEN it is to the doctrine of entire sanctification or complete holiness that we must now direct our thoughts. What is it? What does it involve, and what are its relations? Definitions are abundant, and they are as clear as can be made. They pervade our literature, and I shall attempt nothing new in this line. With the conception of sanctification already given, one can hardly go astray in the application of the auxiliaries mentioned. "Entire sanctification" must mean thorough cleansing, and to be "sanctified wholly" must mean to be cleansed in all parts and to the fullest degree possible. As cleansing results in being made

clean, and as cleanness is purity, and purity is holiness, the wholly sanctified person is completely holy. There is no room for misunderstanding at this point. The Scriptural standard is thus brought out. It is a "clean heart," a "pure heart," a heart cleansed "from all sin," "from all unrighteousness," "purified from all filthiness of the flesh and of the spirit," and hence a state of freedom from sin. Thus sanctification, in all stages, relates to the washing away of sin, the removal from the soul of the pollution and the polluting power of sin. So far as is discoverable from the word, or from the nature of the work, or the nature of the particular process it represents, there is nothing of a positive kind brought into the soul in this cleansing act.

If life is imparted or strengthened, as it doubtless is, that work is not covered by the word sanctification, unless in a few instances where the name of a part is put for the whole. The coincident act of imparting life is specifically expressed by the word "quickening," or the word "regeneration," so that sanctification, whether particular or general, whether partial or complete, in all places and in all applications, retains its significance, and points to cleanness or purity as its resultant state.

This doctrine of entire sanctification is not to be confounded with the evangelical doctrine of Christian perfection, although it is freely conceded that the two doctrines are closely allied and bear important relations to one another. Not a few con-

found them and treat them as if they were identical, using, interchangeably, the terms expressing the different phases of the generic salvation they represent, leading to misconceptions, inaccuracies, distractions, and disputations. If I may be allowed the intimation, and suggest it without undue boldness, I will say that the most serious lack of clearness in the treatment of this subject by our revered founder is at this point. Assuming the oneness of the concrete experience, where the presence of one element implies the presence of all the others, he so speaks as to carry the impression that entire sanctification and Christian perfection are the same thing, and, in some instances, uses one phrase to define the other. For his day, and in view of the

state of the discussion as it came before him and his coadjutors, when the state resultant from the processes of this complex experience was assailed and denied as impossible to the most evangelical faith, his treatment was adequate, and its general soundness to be acknowledged; but when we study the subject in the light of later investigations, when friends of the doctrine have pushed their inquiries to a critical analysis of the component properties and methods of the experience and the induction into it, it is not presumptuous to review the general definitions of the gracious state in question, and seek for more exact descriptions of the processes and elements making up the exceedingly rich inheritance of faith.

Let us, then, attend to some distinctions which will not all prove to be distinctions without a difference. In view of errors prevailing in many minds, it is necessary to distinguish between sanctification and growth. These are not identical. Sanctification is a work, a process, a Divine cleansing; it is a work wrought by the Holy Spirit in answer to prayer and faith, and is, therefore, a present privilege. It occurs at conversion, but is not restricted to the hour of conversion, being neither completed nor discontinued at the period of that wonderful consummation. It goes on, as necessity requires, after conversion, "cleansing and keeping" the heart clean, for without the continuous cleansing the once purified person would contract defilement in

daily contact with external life, as well as through the motions of the flesh or the lingering forces of carnality within.

It is therefore evident that sanctification, as it takes place in conversion, is instantaneous, wrought by a Divine agency, even the same agency that regenerates and imparts life to the soul delivered from the death of sin and raised up into the life of righteousness; and yet that instantaneous washing is not the whole of sanctification, nor the only sanctification. There is beyond it a sanctification which is not instantaneous, but continuous, a progressive work, going on in harmony with gracious provisions for supplementary grace, such as the exposures and temptations of life in this world render necessary. While instanta-

neous in its first manifestation, it is progressive in its continuous processes after conversion, and progressive till the conquest of sin is completed, and the resultant purity warrants the employment of the auxiliaries "entire" and "wholly;" but even this progressive sanctification is not growth. As it is a cleansing, it can not be a growth. It never means that, and can not be called a growth except in an accommodated or metaphorical use of the word. Growth is a process or function of life. It is the manifestation, the unfolding, the outreaching, and devoloping of life. Growth pertains to the life element, and not to the purifying element in the comprehensive salvation. Sanctification aims at purity, tends to purity, results in purity—holiness.

Growth aims at maturity, progresses towards maturity, and culminates in maturity—perfection. Each has its work, its sphere, and its goal, and each is distinct from the other and should be so distinguished in all correct reasoning.

Here arises a question that calls for another distinction, and one not less important than that between sanctification and growth. It is, "Are not these differently-named goals identical?" Some assume that they are, but not many. Divines usually distinguish widely between purity and maturity. In this they do well. They are not identical, nor are they necessarily coetaneous; but they are related, and in a sense mutually dependent. Purity is not maturity, but it is necessary to maturity,

although maturity is not necessary to purity. Purity and holiness are the same, the result of sanctification, the outcome of the spiritual cleansing, and not the outcome of growth in any proper sense, however that may accompany the process and prove to be coincident with it. Maturity is the outcome, the culmination of growth, the state resultant therefrom, and not the immediate product of the cleansing.

Books have been written on purity and maturity, showing the broad distinction between them—some of them good books. Dr. Wood, late of the National Holiness Association, has one which has many excellent features. Dr. McDonald approves it, and in his own works writes in the same strain. Dr. Inskip preached vigorously on

this distinction, insisting upon it as necessary to the proper understanding of the doctrine of holiness. Dr. Asbury Lowrey ably maintained the same ground, and Dr. Daniel Steele walks in the same path with unfaltering step. Besides these, and before their day, many able men, who never attained the doctorate in divinity, grappled the problem with eminent skill, and blazed the way for others to follow. Among these were John Wesley, John Fletcher, and Richard Watson. These all saw the difference between purity and maturity, and all recognized the impropriety of confounding growth in grace with Christian purity.

An additional remark should be made here in justice to our representative authors who have sometimes spoken of purity and

holiness, and maturity and perfection, as if all these terms were about synonymous, and might be used interchangeably. Close observation reveals the fact that in such instances they were not dealing with exact definitions so much as with the state of the persons fully sanctified, whose experience, in fact, included all the processes of pardon, quickening, regeneration, sanctification, growth, development, bearing fruit, and ripening into maturity. As descriptive, or rather as a comprehensive expression of such a state of grace, it is quite allowable to speak of it as a state of entire sanctification, or as a state of maturity, or as Christian perfection. This practice prevailed with our founders and first defenders, as also with later advocates, such as Hed-

ding, Peck, and Foster. It is not necessarily misleading when the general terms are not taken as descriptive of the specific elements, phases, or processes of the one great salvation. As God purifies the heart by faith, and does it at the birth of the believer into the new life, and continues it through all stages of growth, development, enlightenment, and conquest, it is not improper to affirm that men grow into a deeper and broader and purer and stronger spiritual life, the life of faith in the Son of God; for all the different elements in the concrete experience are reciprocally complementary and harmonious, and never antagonistic. The mature Christian is certainly a holy man, and the man who is entirely sanctified is almost as certainly so

well advanced in the spiritual graces that little if any mistake is made in speaking of him as a mature or perfect Christian, as has been the custom of writers on this subject from the beginning.

This brings us to consider another distinction between things that differ, and one which has not received as much attention as have some others. It is the distinction between purity and perfection. In my thought this is essential. Many of the doctors whose activity in this discussion has been marked and largely commendable, have gone quite astray at this point, and, as a consequence, have involved the whole subject in confusion with sad results, such as misleading inquirers, belittling the holiest and grandest attainment possible in

this life, as well as throwing the door wide open for deception, extravagance, fanaticism, and all manner of evils. Of course, so severe an arraignment requires justification, and, being justified, in turn demands the closest consideration.

As above remarked, they make a broad and proper distinction between purity and maturity, and do it well, proving beyond all question that these differ widely in nature, process, and result, showing that purity comes from cleansing, and maturity from growth and the development of the graces of the Christian life. So far, well; but now for the mistake. It is in the fact that after making this distinction between purity and maturity, they make no distinction between purity and perfection. This

omission leaves the impression that purity and perfection are identical, and the writers and preachers in question habitually treat them as one, applying the same Scriptures to the one and the other indifferently, and using the terms interchangeably. The practical result is deplorable beyond question. Intensely zealous followers of such teaching insist on purity of heart as a present privilege, dwell rapturously on the power of the cleansing blood, urge all to seek purity at once, and indirectly, if not directly, disparage the process of growth, or treat it as something relating to a different condition of things in life, and then call upon all whose emotional experiences lead them to believe that their hearts have been purified, to avow that attainment, and call it

Christian perfection. In response to such appeals, many honest and earnest souls, in the ardor of their good intentions, and in the glow of their first love, following the impulses of an enthusiasm born of sincere devotion, accept this teaching, and declare their cleansing, and take upon themselves the high profession of perfection in love. They are not mature—do not claim to be; they are quite immature, young men and young women with little knowledge and little experience in the ways of the world, pure-minded, susceptible, teachable, "babes in Christ," and yet they have been led to make what is manifestly a premature profession of Christian perfection.

Such cases are not rare. They are found in all sections, especially where professional

revivalists have access to the congregations, and cherish the belief that their success and popularity will be measured by the number of their sanctifications. Indeed, they are so numerous as to awaken anxiety in many Churches; and yet, fortunately, through the judicious treatment of pastors and the godly help of experienced Christians, many are rescued from the imminent peril to which they are exposed, and brought to a wise and wholesome consecration of their lives to the service of Christ. But others there are to whom this hasty profession proves disastrous. They run well for a season, and then discover that they are not perfect, but compassed about with weaknesses, liable to temptations, fall into darkness and doubt, and realize that

they have been deceived in the matter of Christian perfection, as they surely have been; and then they too readily yield to the persuasion that their whole experience was a delusion, lose heart and lose faith, fall into apostasy, and are lost.

This picture is not overdrawn, dark as it is. With the teaching and practice described one can scarcely see how a different result could be expected. But let no one imagine that such dire results must follow the judicious teaching of Christian perfection, as found in the Scriptures and received by Methodism. The evil deprecated comes from the abuse of the doctrine, which is also an abuse of Methodism. The broader and clearer view—the real Methodistic view—escapes this danger and

avoids the ruinous perversion of a most precious truth by distinguishing between purity and perfection exactly as we distinguish between purity and maturity. For this there is high authority. The fathers defined perfection by using the word maturity. In their thought these were one, and one was equivalent to the other; they represented the same result, the same grace. The plainest common sense affirms that if there be such a wide difference between purity and maturity, and if there is no difference between maturity and perfection, then there ought to be some distinction between purity and perfection. This is a crucial point. Many excellent writers have shown slight lameness here. As we have seen, Mr. Wesley did not always give

full significance to this distinction. He mostly spoke of the concrete experience, of the condition of the believer in that state, and that in general terms, without noting the distinctions which he undoubtedly recognized. But Mr. Wesley made no distinction between maturity and perfection; neither do our modern doctors attempt to do this, for, indeed, they can not. It is a question as to whether perfection shall be identified with purity or with maturity. It can not be identified with both, because both are not the same, but widely different. If it be identified or made identical with purity, then it precedes maturity, and maturity is not the proper word to use in defining it; and Wesley, Fletcher, Clarke, Watson, Peck, Hedding, Foster, and all the

rest, made a mistake when they accepted as a proper definition the saying: "We give the name of Christian perfection to that maturity of grace and holiness which established adult believers attain to under the Christian dispensation. . . . Hence it appears that by Christian perfection we mean nothing but the cluster and maturity of the graces which compose the Christian character in the Church militant."

Then, assuming that the authorities have made no mistake in thus defining Christian perfection and treating it as identical with maturity, it must follow that it is a serious, far-reaching, and disastrous error to identify it with purity, unless all are mistaken in distinguishing between purity and maturity as they have done. We are tied up

to the choice of identifying perfection with purity or with maturity, and we follow the highest authorities, as well as the dictates of the highest reason, and the Scriptures as well, in making it identical with maturity, and hence in requiring that the same distinction be made between purity and perfection that is made between purity and maturity.

The doctrine of heart-purity through sanctification is a most blessed truth, fully attested in Holy Scripture, and in connection with the new life born into the soul through regeneration, and leading onward to the maturity of faith, love, and all the graces of the Spirit, eventuating in that perfection of Christian character which is the privilege of established believers, is

far too precious to be dragged down into the dust and straw of confused emotionalism, as is done when the necessary distinctions are not made.

While in a loose and general way it may be true that Christian purity stands, in Methodist thought, for Christian perfection, in accurate conception it stands only as preparatory to the higher state, and as a condition precedent to the grandest of all attainments. To be made perfect in Christ Jesus is something which "babes in Christ" are not expected to reach so long as they are "babes," but which becomes their privilege when they "put away childish things" and "grow up into him" unto the measure of the stature of a perfect manhood. There is nothing so great in the realm of spiritual

gifts to men as the perfection of the soul in love to God and love to man—a perfection which means completeness, maturity, ripeness, impossible of attainment except through sanctification of the Spirit unto purity of heart and obedience of life.

III.

It is not possible to understand sanctification as a distinct work of grace without studying it in the light of its relation to other aspects of the complete work of salvation. This method has been pursued thus far, and must be continued to the end. Where three things are essential to a given result, each indispensable, it is useless, as well as difficult, to compare them with a view to forming an estimate of their relative value. If each one is necessary, each may be esteemed as important as the whole, since the whole can not be in the absence of any of its parts.

As has been shown, salvation is composed

of three distinct elements, involving distinct processes, each looking to a distinct result—distinct, but not separated. One gives freedom from condemnation, and in its nature and work is legal; one gives life where death reigned, and in its nature and work is vital; and the other removes filthiness and gives purity, and therefore in its nature and work it is purifying. These elements are distinct in themselves, yet they work together as if one, all springing from the same source or cause, and coming into activity on the same condition. Hence, the justified man is born again and purified from the defilement of all forgiven sin. He is a new creation. In his renewed nature are the elements of a new character, with all the embryotic graces of the Holy Spirit,

with germinating power adequate, if nourished and not repressed, to produce a complete Christian life. This is a rich endowment, worthy of the Divine Giver, and equal to the necessities of any adopted child of God. It is the heritage of faith, comprising all the elements of salvation, and these concurring and working together, each in its place and appropriate sphere, so that, as in the body, one member can not say to another member, "I have no need of thee," so in this gracious work of salvation one element can not say that any other element is needless. God has tempered and adjusted them one to another, and all of them to the development of his own image in the soul. Believing this, and apprehending it clearly, it is only important

to add that one of these elements is not the product of another. Each, in respect of the others, is independent, as each comes from the Divine source as an original endowment, or as an active energy, leaving no room for comparison or for superiority or inferiority in the wonderful gifts of grace. In the divers administrations there is one Spirit.

An important, practical question arises here which disturbs many anxious minds, and furnishes occasion to give a practical turn to this study. It is, "Shall the seeker or the believer distinguish these several elements in his mind, and make one or another the special object of his pursuit, without at the same time concerning himself about the other elements?" It is scarcely possible

to do this intelligently, since one seldom makes mental analysis of the concrete salvation desired, and would find the effort rather distracting than helpful in earnest devotion, even if capable of the intellectual exercise and predisposed to it. But it is a task to which very many are not equal, and therefore it can not be a duty in any such sense as to condition success or to become a law to the inexperienced and uncultured; and since it can not be a law to all, it should not be regarded as a law to any. If purity of heart be singled out and emphasized as the distinct blessing needed, it is because of particular teaching on that point, and may be because the life element becomes vigorous so as to stir the energies of the soul to special sensitiveness and to activity

in drawing near to God for the fullness of his blessing. The heart's real anxiety in its awakened condition is for more of God, for his manifested presence in vivifying the soul, and filling and assimilating it in his own way. In its deepest struggles for purity it cries out for God, for the living God; and when he comes, as come he will, it is without waiting for his needy child to accomplish the intellectual analysis of the great salvation, so as to specify the elements composing it, and rightly distribute them. He who seeks God seeks holiness, and life, and power, and victory, and all there is in salvation. As the object of faith is the Son of God, risen and exalted, and not merely the blessings he purchased in severalty, so, in receiving him, the be-

liever receives whatever is in him, with all needed spiritual illumination, quickening, cleansing, power, and helpfulness. Jesus Christ is made unto him wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption.

The question is still pressed, "Must we not be definite in our aim, fixing the mind on a specific blessing, and ask for that particular thing?" There is no doubt that great explicitness in asking is permissible in our daily devotions; that so far forth as we can know the exact thing we need and desire, we may ask for it in submission to the Divine will; but this does not carry with it the implication that we must distinguish in thought between pardon and purity, or between the life-giving energy and the purifying process, and ask for this and not

for that. Particularizing can be carried too far under the idea of definiteness in aim. The attempt to map out the form and dimensions of every particular blessing, and to name and number each in its order, is a useless task, and unprofitable in the extreme. If we put away sin, and lift up our souls to God in holy consecration for an increase of knowledge and love, earnestly desiring the death unto sin and the life unto righteousness, no disappointment need be feared because of any failure to designate the distinct elements in the saving process most urgently demanded by our actual spiritual state. These elements, however important in themselves, are not so clearly marked that faith may apprehend them separately and with infallible

discrimination. God may be trusted to take care of his own part of the work, and to distribute the elements and manage the processes necessary to it, when, with our needs and helplessness, we put ourselves in his hands.

The question is sometimes asked, with evident sincerity: "Is there any such thing as growing into purity or holiness?" This must be answered because of the use that has been made of it. Catchwords and phrases are sometimes more successful in gaining the attention of people not given to close thinking than are substantial arguments. In the interest of a given theory of sanctification it is said, "You can grow in grace, but not into grace." The application is that there is no such thing as grow-

ing into sanctification or holiness. People are admonished not to await the process of growth to obtain the great benefit of complete redemption, with the result that growth in the knowledge and love of God is disparaged, and the teachings of all who believe in a gradual or progressive sanctification are set at naught without being correctly applied or understood. The answer to the question is both negative and affirmative. In one respect we can not grow into grace, and in another we can, and do, and must. There is a slight difference, of course, between growing in grace and growing into grace, as there is also between growing in holiness and growing into holiness. I call it slight because it is slight, relatively, and has not half the

significance that is sometimes attached to it. One who has no grace can neither grow in grace nor into grace. Spiritual growth is not predicable of such an one in any sense. He must first come into a state of grace by conversion or the renewing of the Holy Spirit; then, being in grace, he can grow in grace, and into more and more of it. He can launch out into the deep water of the boundless sea of God's love and grace, and add to his store of spiritual treasure till filled with all the fullness of God. By daily acquisitions he grows *in* and *into* grace, becoming more spiritual, more devout, and approaches nearer the summit of holiness with every accession of grace to grace. Growth is more properly predicated of spiritual life than of holiness

or purity, as only such things as have the element of life in them grow literally. But the word used metaphorically denotes increase, progress, advancement; for there is growth by accretion as well as by the expansion of life. So there is growth in holiness if there is progress or advancement. As the life implanted in the soul in regeneration expands and gathers strength, there is a normal spiritual growth, with the development of new powers and activities, a veritable increase of spiritual vitality which lifts the renewed man into nearer and holier communion with God. Every accession of spiritual energy advances the Divine life and indicates in the soul greater conformity to the law of love. In this sense there is growth in grace and into grace, and

growth in holiness and into higher degrees of holiness.

Here this point might be concluded but for the persistence of theorists who see more in it than properly belongs to it. Then suffer a little reiteration. A building grows as it advances towards completion. A city grows as it increases in population. A man grows in knowledge as he accumulates information; he grows in wealth as he increases his possessions. The house grows *into* a state nearer the ideal of the builder. The city grows into greater power and greater influence, and the man grows into additional knowledge and into larger wealth. In this sense the Christian who advances in knowledge, wisdom, and purity, grows into purity as well as in purity. The

babe in Christ is in Christ, and therefore in grace, and if he abide in Christ and increase in knowledge and strength, he grows in grace and into grace; and if with his steadfastness and increase of grace he becomes more and more holy, there is not the least impropriety in saying that he grows in holiness and into holiness—into a higher state and degree of holiness. Thus it appears that the use intended to be made of this distinction between growing "in" and "into" is a profitless play on words without doctrinal significance; for it can not be that continued and persistent growth in holiness will forever fail of reaching the standard fixed by the apostle for growing believers, "perfecting holiness in the fear of God." If by daily self-denial, and constant watch-

fulness and prayer, and persistent devotion to duty, one can increase in knowledge, wisdom, purity, and strength, he must be approaching the goal of complete cleansing and perfect love; and if the continuous sanctification needed and promised is a fact in actual experience, there is no doubt that the result will be complete holiness, and holiness wrought within by the Holy Spirit as truly and effectively as if wrought in an instant.

God is not limited to one method of dealing with men, nor does he require of all men a single type of experience. Variety is stamped on all his works, and variety abounds in the world of grace as in the world of nature. While the essential principles of redemption never change, and the

terms of salvation abide without variableness, the incidents and manifestations of grace in the hearts of men reveal as much diversity as can be found in the temperaments, mental aptitudes, and outward conditions of individual life. Variety marks the beginnings of grace, and is found characterizing its work in all stages and grades of development, and it would be strange indeed if in its highest and completest revelation it should lose its wonderful freedom, and become bound to a single, inflexible rule. While contending for the possibility of progressive sanctification, and insisting that by continued advancement in the best elements of Christian life and character the state of entire sanctification can be attained, it is not in my thought or

in my heart to deny that it may be sought and found in sudden and powerful uplifts sometimes vouchsafed to men. It were un-Methodistic to hold otherwise. God can cut short his work in righteousness, and that he does and will when the conditions which he imposes are met, is fact beyond question. Many are sanctified with such overwhelming suddenness that the word instantaneous is not an inapt expression of it. My contention is not against this, but against making it the only possible sanctification, the only way of holiness or to holiness. Thousands of saints walk the earth in the blessed light of holiness—"righteousness and true holiness"—who can not date their entrance into the perfect rest nor recall any startling manifestations in

connection with it. I gladly hail these as the beloved of the Lord, and recognize in them the restored image of God, as I do also those whose testimony points to a given day of complete deliverance, and whose lives conform to their testimony and banish all doubt of its truthfulness.

IV.

The vital doctrine of spiritual growth is so intimately related both to sanctification and Christian perfection that it must be still further considered. It is neither assumed nor presumed that any one intentionally disparages growth in grace and in Christian character in the interest of some theory or phase of the work of sanctification; but the fact can not be ignored that this result is reached to the discouragement and bewilderment of many good people, by the habitual repetition of the saying that one "can not grow into grace," in connection with the emphasis given to the instantaneous feature of the work. In or-

der to have real force or significance for the purpose for which this phrase is used, it ought to be assumed that the grace of entire sanctification is a new grace to be entered at the time of the consummation of the work, having no kinship or relation to the grace received or entered at conversion, so that the incipient sanctification coincident with regeneration can not by any possibility grow or develop into the higher grace. It may be that this meaning has some obscure lodgment in the minds of those who use the phrase; but if so, it has not been avowed, and may not be assumed as true; and yet it seems necessary to the completeness of the doctrine in behalf of which the favorite expression is employed. If the grace of the higher attainment is

the same in kind as that of the incipient spiritual life and the beginning of sanctification, there appears no good reason for denying the possibility of the earlier grace growing into that of the higher degree.

Although sanctification is a work wrought by the Holy Spirit, and not a growth in the strict sense of the word, it nevertheless advances with the development of spiritual life, which is a growth, and therefore it is neither erroneous nor misleading to designate all spiritual advancement as growth in grace. The Word of God grew as its power and influence over men extended; the Church grew as disciples were multiplied; the believer grows up into Christ as he takes on more and more of the life and Spirit of Christ; so

there can be no impropriety in affirming that whatever element or aspect of Christian attainment exhibits increase or progress, is growth in the knowledge and love of God. The work of sanctification advances on the same conditions that secure growth in grace, or in life, or in holiness. It is indeed impossible to find a believer who complies with the conditions of growth, who does not develop a deeper and broader experience in all that is vital in the Christian life and character, and, therefore, who does not correspondingly increase in holiness; and it is useless to contend that a life which continually increases in holiness and in all spiritual graces is not in the highway to the best attainment possible to men on earth. While, in accurate

conception, there is a distinction between growth in the sense of the expansion and unfolding of the life within, and the active work of the Spirit in sanctification, the distinction is in the mind's conception, and is not so palpably important as to have practical bearing on the progress of religion in the heart. The cleansing and the growth go hand in hand, the result of the same agency, the same faith, the same consecration, tending to the same consummation, the perfecting of the soul in purity and in righteousness before God. Sanctification removes obstructions to growth, and the Spirit that purges out the old leaven also quickens and intensifies the activities and energies of "the new man."

The point here insisted upon is the con-

tinued or continuous sanctification. It begins with regeneration, and yet it is only in a loose or general way that we can speak of regeneration as sanctification begun. Regeneration is not sanctification at all, and is not the beginning of sanctification; but sanctification begins at the time regeneration takes place. When the renewal and the quickening occur, the washing is not absent. It is unfair to our standard writers who clearly distinguish between regeneration and sanctification, and then tell us that regeneration is sanctification begun, to attribute to them any meaning other than that the two aspects of the work had a simultaneous beginning, and that the work of cleansing goes right along, and was not completed when regeneration became a

fact. It is quite correct to speak of regeneration as a past event. It is as the day of one's birth, an epoch, or historical fact. We look back to it and date from it. Not so with sanctification. It had a beginning, but not an ending. Indeed, so continuous is its work that it is never safe to assume that it is finished, or that it has become an historical event to be dated and labeled as belonging to the past. The sanctification of yesterday will not do for to-day. We might as well expect the sunlight of yesterday to supply our needs for to-day as to expect the work of cleansing wrought in us in times past to meet our necessities for the future. Sanctification, like the mercies of God, must be new every morning. New battles with the world and the

flesh call for new victories, and new exposures to the corruptions that are in the world require new appropriations of the cleansing blood day by day. There must be an "abiding in Christ," a continuous drawing from him of life and purity, as the branch abiding in the vine draws nourishment from the vine unceasingly. Then there must be great inaccuracy and great impropriety in designating a day when sanctification took place. The language making it a past event always affects my sensibilities unpleasantly; exciting, not derision, but commiseration. The broader and better view accepts all that is instantaneous in the work as its beginning, and as in extraordinary and exceptional upliftings, and all that is continuous, likewise, as in

the regular and normal advancement in knowledge, love, power over sin, and efficiency in the work of God, and consistently holds that growth in the divine life is also growth in holiness.

As sanctification means cleansing, to be sanctified wholly is to be cleansed throughout, in every faculty and power of the soul, and to be cleansed thoroughly. The mind, will, affections, conscience, imagination, desires—all are made clean. Evil tempers, such as anger, pride, envy, jealousy, petulance, censoriousness, are slain and cast out, giving large room for the development of love, meekness, gentleness, kindness, forbearance, patience, and sweetness. The germ of these new graces and virtues is implanted in regeneration, but their growth

is retarded so long as sanctification is incomplete. When the cleansing reaches its ultimate purpose and victory, not only is the old leaven of carnality purged by the action of the Holy Spirit, to the destruction of the evil passions which are of the spiritual nature, but even such as have a physical basis and give tone to all the others, are so subjugated and purified that they lose their dominating power for evil, and readily yield themselves as instruments of righteousness unto holiness. In this condition the "expulsive power of the new affection," together with the "inward grafting of the truth," works with marvelous effectiveness in advancing the graces of the new life towards maturity or perfection. The mind that was in Christ takes the

place of the mind of selfishness. The love of Christ triumphs over the love of the world. The gentleness of Christ makes the sanctified strong, clothing him with whatsoever is lovely and of good report, making it impossible for him to be morose or sour. There is beauty in the sanctified life which is always attractive. It never repels by assumed sanctimoniousness. It puts on no airs of superior sanctity, and "vaunteth not itself." It never treats contemptuously the attainments of others. When every thought is brought into captivity to the obedience of Christ, envy and strife expire, and faultfinding with the Church, and with the times, and especially with those of smaller attainments, becomes too obnoxious to be cherished or tolerated. The

life of such a one becomes a song of praise and proves itself a benediction. It is broad, generous, noble; it is a life of faith, steady, unfluctuating, ever rising to wider horizons, and leading onward to new experiences in the knowledge and love of God. He who is thus sanctified is surely nearing the state of Christian perfectness; nay, may we not assume that ordinarily he is perfect in love and filled with the Spirit? He is "indeed dead unto sin and alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord."

Having distinguished between entire sanctification as a work wrought by the Holy Spirit in cleansing, and the perfection that follows the cleansing, it is not improper to recognize the fact that the resultant state of complete holiness means

more than is expressed by the terms descriptive of the cleansing. There is not only an emptying of the heart of sin, but the additional work of filling it with love; there is not only the "putting off of the old man," wrought in the cleansing, but the "putting on of the new man, which, after God, is created in righteousness and true holiness." The double process is larger than the single process. It looks well to the Godward side, to the affiliation and the fellowship with the Father, the filling bringing into the soul more than was cast out by the emptying.

While in a true sense the first conditions the second, the entire sanctification preparing for the fullness of God, it is not necessary to assume that in all cases the full-

ness ensues at the moment of the cleansing. The latter may be as gradual as the former, and yet it will not be serious error if we accept it as the rule to expect God to come in as fast as sin goes out; that the new man is put on as rapidly as the old man is put off; that the rising with Christ takes place at the instant of the death unto sin. Taking this as the rule, it still remains in the realm of possibility that there may be exceptions, and that in some experiences where the heart is clean the love of God is not perfected, as all the active graces have not come to maturity. Christian perfection means so much, and includes such a wide range of spiritual graces, that there must be variety in its attainment as well as in its manifestation. All

the fruit of the Spirit may not ripen at once; but this is not to hinder our faith in the possibility of complete salvation for every child of God. The babe in Christ will grow to the fullness of the stature of a perfect man, and the Holy Ghost will dwell within as an abiding Guest—nay, as the Lord of the mansion—the life and light and glory of the living temple.

V.

After what has been said, some will possibly receive the impression that, while discouraging theorizing on the subject of sanctification, I am indulging to some extent in that which I disapprove in others. This inconsistency may appear on the face of what is written, but will disappear on closer thought. The exploiting of a theory with a view to elucidate the whole process of the cleansing, with its method and mode, and holding it as complete and exclusive, so as to set aside as untrue all that is not contained in it, is exceedingly objectionable. A theory which says that God does or must do his work in this way, and not

in that way, producing this type of experience, and no other, assumes too much, induces bigotry in its votaries, and repels by its positiveness; but to recognize all the varied and essential features of personal experience as developed in the consciousness of advanced Christians, and attested by the Spirit, is necessary to the best apprehension of the subject. Such is the purpose of this writing. It aims, not to advance a theory, but to ascertain knowable truth—to bring out as much of the hidden mystery of salvation as our minds can grasp, and be content with that, without trying to penetrate the darkness which conceals the mode of the Divine procedure. We stand in awe before the incomprehensible love of God, accepting gladly what is re-

vealed, and with equal gladness adore the wisdom which reserves so much for the revelations of the future. Instead of setting theory against theory, or of belittling the experience of any, it seems wiser in every way to search for a doctrine of Divine cleansing which is great enough to provide for every want of every soul, to furnish room for every phase of God's work, and broad enough to comprise every type and every degree of progress made in any one's advancement from spiritual death unto the life of righteousness. It must be that a gospel which does not provide for all the types and grades of experience possible to earnest men seeking God, is in itself imperfect, and inadequate as a remedy for human needs. Theories

devised by men fall short of this standard, but the glorious gospel of Christ knows no limitations. We want no theory that restricts God's work to a given type, or that becomes an iron rule to measure all attainments as to method and form. Indeed, any theory is useless that is less than the gospel, or that fails to account for any and every possible manifestation of grace in any genuine experience.

In studying different types of experience the various temperaments of people must be taken into the account, as well as their training and habits; for all these play important parts in determining what they will do and how they will proceed in seeking God, and coming into the Christian life, as well as in advancing to the higher states

of grace. "Many men of many minds," and men of extremely different environments, are to be met and rescued and transformed—cleansed and built up in the likeness of God. The gospel, if Divine, must have provisions and be sufficiently flexible to meet every condition, and to fit the peculiarities and idiosyncrasies of every individual. It is therefore unwise to expect that all will receive the grace of God in the same way, while there is great folly in supposing that by any possible constraint every one can be brought to measure up to one given type of Christian experience, either in its earlier or later stages. Diversity marks the work of God from incipiency to consummation.

Let it not be forgotten, as remarked here-

tofore, that the foundation principles of redemption and the essential terms of salvation are always the same; but that in the revelations of saving power in the soul, and in all the steps of progress following the induction into Christ, there are innumerable varieties, giving to each man an experience that is personal and unique. From all this the fact is readily deducible that it is improper to make any man's experience a standard or a model for the experience of other people. There is no model experience. Christ is the model man. His active life as a man was perfect, and to be imitated; but he never experienced the cleansing or washing from sin which our sanctification implies. He was not regenerated or sanctified as sin-

ners must be; and therefore he never illustrated in anything he did or suffered the process of passing from sin to holiness. He declared and lived up to the standard of moral purity necessary for our complete union with himself, and made the way possible, so that every one, each with his personal characteristics and his individual environments, may come up to the full measure of duty and privilege without in the least ceasing to be himself. The quiet man of phlegmatic temperament can reach the high standard, and continue quiet; while the man of impulsive nature will rise, perhaps more rapidly, to the same standard, but with almost superhuman emotions and marvelous demonstrations.

But what of these universally acknowl-

edged facts? Why mention them here? They bear on the question of mode or method in sanctification, and in all spiritual attainments. They are particularly suggestive in connection with what sometimes appears to be a conflict between the doctrine of continuous sanctification and what is known as the "second blessing" theory. In view of the amount of stress laid on this theory in many places, it seems improper to pass it over without mention, although to analyze or discuss it as a theory transcends my design. Both these "theories" look to the same result. They contemplate the perfect cleansing. They are not in conflict except when one is made to exclude the other, and is held as the only possible form of sanctification. When

each is kept in its place they are not exclusive. Hence, without inconsistency, one may accept both these theories, and it seems necessary to do this in order to take in the whole gospel, and to include all types of personal experience and testimony. As theories they appear antagonistic, but as affirmations of different phases or types of genuine experience, they are harmonious, and one is the complement of the other. But in fairness it must be said, in order to a good understanding, that in my thought, the continuous sanctification which accompanies the regular unfolding and expansion of the life element in the quickened soul, is rightly accounted the ordinary and orderly process; while the mighty upheaval in the emotional nature,

which results in the spiritual uplift known as the second blessing, is an extraordinary manifestation vouchsafed under unusual conditions. That it is many times a most blessed reality is not to be questioned. God's wonderful love is equal to all emergencies, and extraordinary revealings of power respond to vehement calls from the depths of penitence. The great thing is the purified heart, whether it come like the rush of the tornado, or with the gentleness of the refreshing breeze. It is not the manner of the process, but the result that abides—the purity which leads onward with the progress of spiritual life to that maturity which is perfection. The heart purified, whether suddenly or gradually, becomes the banqueting-house of the King.

It is the temple of the Holy Ghost. The Son comes to abide, and brings the Father, and fills the temple with love. Who that enjoys this will contend about the mode of the incoming, or the process?

The effect of the cleansing, the sanctification, is holiness, that holiness which conditions maturity and perfection. Holiness in men is relative. In God it is absolute and underived. With him it is not an attainment, but one of the perfections of his being, and has no process, and can not have degrees. With us it is an attainment, having a process and existing in degrees. It is an effect, the product of an agency working within, and working in harmony with the law of our being, the invincible nature with which we are en-

dowed. It is possible, therefore, that holiness in us may be more or less complete, and exist in degrees, even after the cleansing, so that those sanctified need to go on habitually practicing self-denial, and "perfecting holiness in the fear of God."

It was doubtless such a view as this that induced the fathers to be so guarded in defining the highest attainable experience, restricting it to "established adult believers." They included in it more than the process of washing—more than incipient holiness—even the fullness of love, matured and ripened into the image of God. In their high conception there was not only the indwelling Spirit, but the fruit of the Spirit in full cluster. It is well to urge young Christians to seek purity of heart,

to induce them to aspire after it with all earnestness, as a present privilege secured by faith in Christ without delay, but not to mislead them to the assumption that heart-purity is the whole of Christian perfection. Those thoroughly sanctified need time to test their attainments, "to prove their own selves," and to reach intelligent conclusions. Then they may become witnesses indeed, and their testimony will mean something. Much in our day passes for testimony which is not. The mere recital of a sentiment is not testimony. That only is testimony which springs from the heart, which declares a truth known and tested, which alleges a fact discerned and apprehended in the consciousness, and made palpable to the understanding. The wit-

ness knows what he affirms. What he has felt and seen he tells with confidence. Much more such testimony is needed in the Church. Holiness is promoted by it, and every virtue of the Christian life is made stronger and advanced toward maturity under its inspiring influence.

VI.

The attitude of the Church towards this theme at the present time is important, for that alone will sway the minds of many people. Does the Methodist Episcopal Church stand to-day where she stood in the years that have gone? Does she hold fast the standards? Does she revere the testimony of the fathers? Does she, as of old, make holiness the objective point in all her teaching? At least in profession she certainly does. There has been no modification of her doctrine in this respect, and no serious dissatisfaction with it, so far as appears in her pulpits or literature. Then, has there come over her spirit such apathy

as to create the necessity for extraordinary measures to awaken her to a proper sense of her duty and calling? It is proper that this question be propounded, and that it be answered, not according to one's feelings or preferences, but by the facts existing and open to the observation of all men. It must be admitted that there is occasion for anxiety and earnest solicitude. Shall we faithfully consider the situation and the best method of improvement?

The ministry must be held to large responsibility for the spiritual state of the Church. Has there been deterioration? One must think closely before pronouncing a positive conclusion.

Large numbers have come into the pulpits of Methodism with little knowledge of

the early struggles of our founders, or of the doctrinal contests through which they passed in reaching the conclusions which have become our inheritance. These young men come with theological opinions molded in schools where Methodist standards are not the text-books, and where there is large desire to keep abreast of the times in modern exegesis and criticism. With commendable zeal they enter the pastorate as Methodist preachers, with slight appreciation of the symbols of our faith and of the peculiarities which distinguish us from the Churches around us. It is not strange, therefore, that now and then new shadings of thought appear in the interpretations of the faith given to our people. Without intent to depart from our doctrines,

some of our youngerly men take on the tone and terminology of others not in accord with our traditions, and tinge their preaching with colorings out of harmony with what many of us deem regular. So much we must concede to those who express fears that our distinguishing tenets are being forgotten; and, conceding this, we would not ignore the danger of drifting in the winds of popular thought after loosening from the moorings of the past. We therefore earnestly ask whether we have safeguarded the treasure committed to our care.

So far as this could be done by Church action, we have secured the future most thoroughly. The primary design of Methodism is set forth conspicuously in our Dis-

cipline. No one can read our connectional proclamation to the world without learning that we recognize ours as a providential mission "to spread Scriptural holiness over these lands." At their induction into the office our ministers avow their faith in our doctrines, pledge themselves to preach and maintain them, and declare that they "expect to be made perfect in love in this life," and that they "are earnestly striving after it." Every one is therefore committed to this doctrine, and pledged to its promulgation, and therefore there can not be an enemy to holiness in our ministry. Incidental deviations from our standards, as above indicated, are exceptional, and to be regretted. The Church stands upon foundations which have not been shaken.

But that the spirit of apathy too often prevails is not to be denied. In spite of good intentions, lethargy creeps into the Churches and benumbs the energies of preachers and people, resulting in much loss of power. Whither shall we turn for the remedy? Shall we look outside of the Church to find it?

In other lines of human activity, as in the sciences, the arts, and in the professions, as well as in business, much of the best work is done by specialists—by those who devote time, learning, talents, and their best energies to a particular topic or method of investigation, so as to secure all the advantages of concentration. Is it not well to encourage specialists in the Church? A division of work is necessary in all great

L. of C.

enterprises. In this great field some must be pastors, some teachers, some editors, some publishers, and some given to the superintendency. Each does more effective service in his place than he could do by trying to work in all departments. Some have special gifts for revival work, and some for expository work, and some for teaching. Let each exercise his best gifts and work according to his best aptitudes. This is the Providential order. Surely, then, there is work for specialists in the Church of God.

But this is not the kind of specialism in mind when the work of promoting holiness is in question. The selection of a particular doctrine, or some phase of a doctrine, and giving it undue prominence, and

magnifying it so as to make more of it than belongs to it—that is a different thing. No matter how important the doctrine in itself and in its proper relation, there is unwisdom in making a hobby of it. By making too much of sanctification some other doctrine is inevitably disparaged. The harmony of things is broken. Extremes beget extremes. The specialist always becomes an extremist. By pushing his specialty he provokes opposition or induces indifference in others. Besides, the lifting of any single doctrine out of its place distorts the truth to the disparagement of the gospel itself, and the weakening of its power over the unsaved. In every aspect of the case it seems unfortunate that the subject of holiness should be

turned over to specialists. Good men they may be, but they can not be wise, and their methods are never well adapted to building up symmetrical Christian character. There is need that the whole Church awake to the importance of her position as the Divinely appointed instrumentality for promoting and spreading Scriptural holiness. The preachers must lead. Much can be done in our theological schools, and much in our Conferences, while our examining boards can be exceedingly helpful in repressing factional and morbid developments and arresting unwholesome tendencies in the ministry. There is need for vigilance in all the lines of our Church activities.

All the Lord's people ought to be a holy

people. The Church is a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a peculiar people. In their baptismal covenant they are every one consecrated and set apart to a sacred service. In recent years there has come into use a descriptive phrase — "holiness people" — which strikes the sensibilities of conscientious men and women unpleasantly because of its discriminating implications. In a good sense, all Methodists are "holiness people," and yet such a designation under existing conditions would be regarded as unfortunate, if not offensive. Such is the power of association! In connection with this appears also a habit which good people ought to deprecate—that of looking upon all who do not identify themselves

with the so-called "holiness people" as enemies of holiness. This is sad. The great body of Church members are intelligent enough to dissent from the peculiar methods of these specialists without rejecting the doctrine of holiness as taught by the Church, or becoming alien to its spirit. O how we need to widen out!

After all, the best people in the world are sanctified people. They fear God, and walk humbly before him. In their hearts there is neither bigotry nor bitterness. They find good in Christians of all grades of experience, and lament what they can not commend. They are magnanimous as well as humble, and grateful as well as charitable. Their measure is found in the thirteenth chapter of First Corinthians, in

the apostle's description of love. Whatever is there said of love may be said of him who loves God supremely and his neighbor as himself. In such an one there is not an element of self-righteousness, pride, or vainglory—nothing forced or artificial—nothing that repels. For him or his profession no apology is requisite. His holiness needs no vocal proclamation. The light of it shines forth with steady and increasing ray. His faith excludes boastfulness and censoriousness, while his love delights in goodness, and leads him to rejoice in every observable token of prosperity in the Church of God.

Sept 1903

AUG 10 1901

Deacidified using the Bookkeeper process.
Neutralizing agent: Magnesium Oxide
Treatment Date: August 2005

PreservationTechnologies
A WORLD LEADER IN PAPER PRESERVATION
111 Thomson Park Drive
Cranberry Township, PA 16066
(724) 779-2111

BT
765

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 014 650 607 0